



Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste

Comment Sheet

RECEIVED

Name:

TOM MENEFEE

JAN 19 2000

Organization:

Mailing Address:

7892 W. Ogden Rd
LAS VEGAS, NV

Zip: 89113

Telephone number (optional): ()

I request that these comments be made a part of the official record.

Inadequate evaluation of uncertainties.

- 1 • The DEIS is full of imprecise language like "very unlikely", "sufficient quantity", "probably would", etc. How are we to make a sound decision on a project of enormous scope as Yucca Mountain when we can't be certain of the science contained within.
- 2 • All of the "understanding" of how the repository will function in the future is based on computer models, so the long-term impacts are based on arguably incomplete data fed into largely untested models. Since many of these models represent chaotic systems there can be little to no guesswork, otherwise the calculated results (long-term impacts) could bear no resemblance to reality.
- 3 • Why is it that the DOE doesn't trust computer models for nuclear weapons testing, but does for the Yucca Mountain Project? Yucca Mountain performance in the far future is at least as complex as weapons design.

- 4 It is not just road waste materials brought across country
to endanger lives, which can happen with the possibility of
earthquakes, from the waste where it is placed. The truck traveling
across country can pose a danger in traffic. What happened in the
war that left soldiers disabled years later with chemical warfare.
Please note: For your comment(s) to be considered in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, your comment(s) need to be received by the Department of Energy by February 9, 2000. To the extent practicable the Department will consider comments received after February 9.

It can happen in Nevada, we're not here to be an
experiment for the government.